

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

By the foregoing amendments, independent claims 1, 6, 11, 12, 13, and 18 have been amended to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the applied prior art.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 18, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,550,937, hereinafter *Bell et al.* In response to that rejection, independent claims 1, 6, 11, 13, and 18 have been amended to more carefully define the corresponding point searching unit. Support for the amendments may be found in paragraphs [0053] through [0062] on pages 10-12 of the application as originally filed. Specifically, the corresponding point searching unit searches at least one of the corresponding points in the low precision areas and searches at least one set of corresponding points in the high precision areas. The corresponding point searching unit uses the results of the search of corresponding points in the low precision areas as a default for beginning the search of corresponding points in the high precision areas. See, e.g., paragraphs [0059] – [0060] of the application for a description of a preferred embodiment of this portion of the invention. As a result of the present invention, corresponding points can be located in both the high and low precision areas with a minimal duplication of effort and at a high speed. In particular, the corresponding

point search in the high resolution areas can be carried out accurately and rapidly.  
See paragraph [0060] of the present application.

In contrast to the present invention, in *Bell et al.*, there are a plurality of pairs of points in images of different resolutions. In *Bell et al.*, the corresponding point search is duplicated in both the high resolution portions as well as in the low resolution portions.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments to the independent claims 1, 6, 11, 13, and 18, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 18, and 22. Claims 2 and 14 have been canceled.

Claims 3 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bell et al.* as applied to the independent claims, and further in view of the *Akimoto* reference. However, *Akimoto* does not overcome the deficiency of *Bell et al.* Accordingly, dependent claims 3 and 15 are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 13.

Claims 4, 12, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bell et al.*, in view of *Akimoto*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,011, hereinafter *Francini*. However, *Akimoto* and *Francini* do not overcome the deficiency with regard to *Bell et al.* Accordingly, claims 4 and 16 are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 13.

Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the specific areas are designated in the standard model in advance. A preferred embodiment of this aspect of the

invention is described in paragraph [0084] on page 15 of the present application. Since this feature is also not taught or suggested by *Bell et al.*, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of amended claim 12.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bell et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,989, hereinafter *Bell '989*. However, *Bell '989* does not overcome the deficiency with regard to *Bell et al.* as set forth above. Accordingly, dependent claims 7, 9, 10, 20, and 21 are also patentable over the applied prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 6 and 18.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: March 28, 2005

By: 

William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620